



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,023	12/08/2005	Sun-Uk Kim	76303-003US1	1005
69713	7590	03/29/2010		
OCCHIUTI ROHLICEK & TSAO, LLP			EXAMINER	
10 FAWCETT STREET			SNELTING, ERIN LYNN	
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/29/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@ORTPATENT.COM

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/560,023

Examiner

Erin Snelting

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Art Unit

1791

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED **15 March 2010** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,6,7 and 9

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: See Continuation Sheet

/Steven P. Griffin/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

--In response to Applicant's argument that Kang requires that silica balls have low density and Duraiswami teaches that use of a rotary furnace increased the density of spheres, and thus a skilled artisan would not have modified the Kang process by using the rotary tube furnace as taught by Duraiswami, as doing so would have rendered this method unsatisfactory for its intended purpose:

--Duraiswami teaches that rotary tube furnace processing affects other physical properties of spheres besides porosity, such as strength. Thus, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the method of Kang with the rotary tube furnace processing of Duraiswami for the benefit of optimizing physical properties of the resulting spheres, as described in the previous Office action. While Duraiswami provides a single non-limiting example in which sphere density increased slightly with rotary tube furnace processing, Applicant has provided no evidence that the use of the rotary tube furnace of Duraiswami with the method and materials of Kang would necessarily produce spheres of unacceptable density. The same reasoning applies to the arguments regarding claims 6, 7, and 9.

--In response to Applicant's argument that the spheres of Kang and Duraiswami have different sizes and different pore sizes, and thus the densities are not able to be directly compared:

--Examiner agrees with Applicant's argument. However, Examiner maintains that a skilled artisan would still have been motivated to modify the method of Kang with the rotary tube furnace processing of Duraiswami for the benefit of optimizing physical properties of the resulting spheres, as described above and in the previous Office action.

--In response to Applicant's argument that claim 2 is not rendered obvious by Kang and Duraiswami:

--Kang teaches that the properties as claimed in claim 2 are result effective variables and may be optimized by one of ordinary skill in the art, as described in the previous Office action.

Continuation of 13. Other: The amended claims would be rejected by the same references as applied in the Final Rejection dated 11-13-2009.